

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Please replace the sheets containing Fig. 1 and Fig. 3 with the attached replacement sheets.

In the replacement sheets, Fig. 1 has been amended to show the first beam cross section 32 and the second beam cross section 34. Figure 3 has been amended to correct typographical errors.

No new matter has been added in the making of these amendments.

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The label for the first cross section and second cross section has been added to figure 1 as requested in the Office Action. Figure 3 has also been amended as requested in the Office Action. The objection to the drawings is therefore moot.

The specification has been amended as requested in the Office Action. The objection to the specification is therefore moot.

The present claims are patentable over Fukuda, US Patent 4904569. Fukuda fails to disclose or even fairly suggest a focused beam having a first cross section before passing through a saturable absorber and a second cross section after passing through a saturable absorber. Fukuda discloses a reversible transmission film that is "opaque before the film is illuminated with exposure light, becomes transparent when the film is illuminated with exposure light, and becomes opaque again opaque when the illumination of the film with the exposure light is stopped." See, U.S. Pat. No. 4,904,569, Col 13, l. 38-43.

This cannot be fairly viewed as disclosing a saturable absorber which only allows a portion of beam through the saturable absorber such that the cross section of the beam leaving the saturable absorber is smaller than the cross section of the beam entering the saturable absorber because Fukuda only discloses a reverse transmission film that becomes opaque or transparent based on **the illumination or quantity of light** and not based on the intensity of a beam. As one having ordinary the art would understand, the quantity of light is not synonymous with the intensity of a beam. Further, Fukuda fails to disclose anything pertaining a beam, much less the cross section of a beam leaving a saturable absorber being smaller than a beam entering a saturable absorber

The claims are further patentable over Lu, US Patent 7022452. The Office Action admits that Lu does not tech a saturable absorber and the description of the contrast enhancing layer does not necessarily suggest that it operates such that light absorption decreases with increasing light intensity. If anything, Lu indicates that light transmission increases with increasing intensity. Therefore, the claims are patentable over Lu.

If there are any additional fees due in connection with this communication, please charge Deposit Account No. 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

Dated: September 7, 2010

/Timothy M Nitsch/  
Timothy M Nitsch  
Reg. No. 58,019  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Willis Tower  
Chicago, IL 60606-1080  
312-876-2608